DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 239 SP 020 199

AUTHOR Copeland, Willis D.; Kingsford, Steve
TITLE Helping Schools Plan Staff Development: A Study of an Approach to In-service Education.
INSTITUTION Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Calif. Teachers' Centers Exchange.
PUB DATE [81]
NOTE 78p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; Educational Needs; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; Intermode Differences; Needs Assessment; Participant Satisfaction; *Program Design; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; School Districts; *Staff Development; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Education Programs; *Teacher Workshops; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

The effectiveness of two approaches used by the Ventura-Santa Barbara County (California) School Resource Network to meet district-wide staff development needs is evaluated in this report. A new inservice training method, characterized by facilitation teams working within schools on site-specific needs, is contrasted to a district-wide topical workshop program already in progress. Twelve assumptions held by the network in its development of the new inservice training approach are presented and analyzed. Principal findings of the study, based on semifocused interviews, structured interviews, and questionnaires, center around: (1) the differing nature of teachers' professional needs and how identification of those needs entered into planning the facilitation team process; (2) beneficial effects of the facilitation staff development process; (3) difficulties and negative responses to the facilitated staff development process; and (4) effects of larger problems beyond the scope of the network's efforts. A summary discusses how the effects of the two approaches compare with the twelve assumptions' implicit goals. Appendixes contain a description of the methodology, examples of "shopping lists" used to assess prospective workshop participants' needs and interests, and data collection instruments. (FG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED218239

HELPING SCHOOLS PLAN STAFF DEVELOPMENT:

A STUDY OF AN APPROACH TO IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

Willis D. Copeland - Robert B. Everhart
University of California, Santa Barbara

Steve Kingsford
School Resource Network
Ventura, California

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William M. Hering

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Prepared For:

Teachers' Centers Exchange
Far West Laboratory
1855 Folsom Street
San Francisco, California 94103

SP 020 199

This product has been produced with support from the Program for Research on Experienced Teacher Centers, Far West Laboratory of Educational Research and Development. Its contents do not necessarily reflect the Views or Policies of the Far West Laboratory, the National Institute of Education or the Department of Education.

No part of this report may be reproduced without permission of the authors.

Special acknowledgement is hereby made to Carolyn Bogad, Ken Kickbush and Stan Witnov for their extraordinary work in data collection and analysis. A sincere expression of gratitude is also made to the teachers and administrators of the several schools in Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties in which we conducted our research, and to the staff of the Ventura/Santa Barbara School Resource Network. Without their cooperation, studies such as this are not possible. We hope that, in return, their work of educating our children will be made in some way easier and more productive.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
THE STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	4
Assumptions on Which the Program Was Based	4
Characteristics of the Facilitation Team approach	5
Assumptions concerning process of facilitation	8
EXAMINATION OF THE SRN FACILITATION TEAM APPROACH	10
A Contrasting Approach to Staff Development: The "Shopping List"	11
RESULTS	12
Focus on Different Natures of Teachers' Needs	12
Staff development to meet individual needs	15
Staff development to meet school-wide needs	16
The needs and success of staff development	18
Focus on Beneficial Effects of Facilitated Process	21
Substantive changes in policy or practice	22
Changes in school climate	23
Colleague interaction	24
The open nature of the needs assessment process	26
Focus on Difficulties of Facilitated Process	27
Lack of follow-up	29
Possible follow-up role of SRN not understood	30
Lack of early involvement of teachers in the process	32
Lack of consideration of time and timing	35
Large Programs Beyond the Reach of SRN	38
SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION	39
Teachers' Involvement in Planning	40
The Role of the Facilitation Team	41
Time and the Process	42
The Effectiveness of the Facilitation Team	43
Needs that Emerge from Group Meetings	44

Page

APPENDICES 48

A. Methodology 48

B. The Shopping Lists 53

C. Data Collection Instruments 62

D. Summary of Questionnarie Data 70

Introduction

Some seven years ago, Roy Edelfelt stated that "the in-service education of teachers will be the major focus in teacher education for the next decade." The dramatic increase in the literature devoted to staff development in the insuing years appears to justify Edelfelt's prediction. Indeed, in the year immediately prior to the writing of this report, three major journals have devoted entire special issues to the topic of staff development (The Journal of Research and Development in Education, Journal of Education, and Theory Into Practice).

As the volume of such research is changing, so is the nature of staff development itself. Historically, in-service or staff development has been typified by workshops devoted to specific classroom-related problems and their ultimate solutions. After attending these workshops, typically offered by "experts" in a given area, teachers return to their classrooms and ostensibly attempt to make changes in their own classroom behaviors, changes that are presumed ultimately to affect student learning.

While such workshops predominate, the literature indicates that "most staff development programs do not drastically change a teacher's classroom behavior" (Perry, 1980:260). Faced with this lack of effects, those responsible for inservice teacher education are turning to other strategies. Many of these new strategies are characterized by "major changes in the governance of in-service education" (Edelfelt, 116) and an understanding that the focus of staff development is no longer restricted to the individual teacher seeking solutions to specific, class-related needs. Rather, staff development is increasingly concerning itself with an "educational system which can regenerate itself continuously" and the need for school communities to "find ways to nurture the personal, social, and academic potential" of people in those communities (McKibben & Joyce, 1980:253). To

the extent that these patterns are indicative of changing trends, they represent a movement toward more collaborative, client generated, organizationally based staff-development models.

Yet we know very little about the results of such a shift in approaches toward staff development. Not only is the quantity of information sparse, but as might be expected in a field that has exploded so rapidly in such a short period of time, the quality of research that focuses upon the changing nature of staff development is low. Edelfelt states that "there is almost no significant research and evaluation going on in connection with in-service education programs" (Edelfelt, 115). Indeed, as much of the literature reveals, trends and patterns in inservice staff development come and go as frequently as weather changes. Their documentation goes no further than a decriptive "We did this and our teachers appeared to like it. You should try it too." The rationale for choosing one approach over another is unclear.

Of what should such a rationale consist? At the most sophisticated level it would be desirable to base choice of approaches to inservice teacher education on experimental data which predict the potential effects of each approach. Unfortunately, the possibility for such predictions is well beyond the current "state of the art." Field based research is not even close to providing the needed specific and experimentally verified data.

A step back from experimental verification is inquiry into the assumptions on which inservice training approaches are based. The specifics of staff development change from site to site. Ideosyncratic differences in teachers, schools, districts and communities in which they work will, of necessity, require each inservice activity to be specifically unique in its setting. Thus, though descriptions abound of inservice activities found to be successful when tried with one set of clients, their utility for generalizing to and positively affecting other clients in other settings is limited.

Assumptions on which these varieties of activities are based are much less numerous. It might be expected that, though specific characteristics of staff development efforts vary from site to site, the assumptions that guide the planning and implementation of these programs are much more limited in number, can be transferred and, above all, can be explicated and their affects on inservice programs examined. It should be possible to uncover both the stated and implied assumptions which guide the work of a particular staff development program and then observe the effects of conforming to these assumptions on the program's results. Such assumptions, identified and verified, could be more easily and appropriately transferred to other staff development efforts than would the details of implementation which currently occupy the literature.

This document reports the effort of a research project to focus on the assumptions which appeared to drive a selected staff development program. The project attempted to identify the effects of heeding those assumptions on the products of the program. The inservice program itself exemplified some of the major changes in the nature of staff development noted above. This program, designed to alter the manner in which decisions about staff development were made, as well as the strategies for carrying out or implementing the decisions, was designed around the presence of staff development "faciliatation teams." The function of these teams was to assist the faculty to identify staff development needs in schools, prioritize them, and, if requested, to facilitate the solving of those needs. The document will first outline the nature of that program. Next, we will review the assumptions which guided the program, noting specifically some of the major deviations from what normally is thought of as "staff development." We will then turn to the results of the program, attempting to synthesize

those results as they reflect the assumptions on which the program was based.

The Staff Development Program

In the Fall of 1980 the School Resource Network (SRN), a regional teacher center serving Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties and located in Ventura, California, undertook to offer a new service to the schools in its service area. This service would make available to any interested school an SRN Facilitation Team composed of three members who were specially trained in facilitating staff development planning meetings. These teams, composed of teachers and administrators who were volunteers, were available to assist schools in the identification of staff development needs, as well as to facilitate subsequent activities designed to meet those needs. A Facilitation Team, once its services were requested, would come to the school and take full responsibility for managing the process of "needs assessment" at a meeting of the school staff. The team's goal was to encourage a wide-ranging discussion of school staff needs, to set priorities, and to identify possible staff development procedures that could meet those needs. The Facilitation Team's involvement was to result in a plan of action which could invoke a variety of additional support services, some available locally, others from SRN.

Assumptions on Which the Program Was Based

The use of Facilitation Teams as a vehicle for implementing staff development was based on a number of assumptions about changing professional behavior, adult learning, and the organizational and social nature of schools as workplaces. These assumptions are revealed via examination of SRN's files and communications, interviews with SRN personnel, and observation of Facilitation Team training sessions.

The assumptions listed below fall into two primary categories. First

are the main assumptions concerning inservice staff development via the Facilitation Team approach. Second are some specific assumptions which are believed by the SRN staff to underlie successful operation of the Facilitation Team themselves.

Characteristics of the Facilitation Team Approach

1. Improvement in student learning requires change in the instructional behavior of teachers. Though staff development aims at improving students' learning, its method focuses on changes in teachers. Some changes are related to specific instructional performance (e.g., appropriate use of wait time or assertive discipline). Others may more broadly impact the teachers (e.g., dealing with teacher stress or even exploring alternative careers for educators).

2. Teachers, like all people, are reluctant to change. We are all so "set in out ways" that change is often a slow and even painful process. Patterns of behavior rule our actions. Teachers are understandably hesitant to discard their comfortable "old shoes," even when told the new pair will work much better. The new ones just don't seem to "fit" as well.

3. Teachers are more likely to change their professional behaviors if the changes are perceived as meeting the teachers' felt needs. Staff development specialists have long known that the adoption of prescriptions for change is dependent on their acceptance by teachers. Telling teachers what they ought to do is no guarantee that they will do it. Instead, teachers must clearly understand that a given prescription has a high possibility of meeting a need of which the teacher is aware and for which the teacher wants help. An SRN staff member, when writing the proposal to solicit funds for this research project, quoted one specialist as writing, "Too many in-service training activities address the needs of trainers rather than those

of trainees." (Hall, 1977).

4. No one set of prescriptions for teaching is appropriate for all teachers. Improvement of learning through adoption of prescriptions for change is hampered by another condition, that is the absence of an integrated and verified set of axioms that describe generic "good" teaching. Given our current understanding of what teachers do to help students learn, it would be foolhardy to assume that any single prescription for improvement would be appropriate for all teachers at all times. An SRN publication which describes the Facilitation Team process makes the point that "Staff development in general receives considerable criticism because it frequently...treats all participants as thought they have the same needs, styles and responsibilities."

5. To insure that staff development activities are perceived as meeting teachers' felt needs, teachers must be involved in the entire process of planning, implementing, evaluating and following up the activities. In a written description of the facilitation process, an SRN author stated "Evidence shows that when participants have (and take) the opportunity to assess their own needs and wants, plan their own staff development the way they want it done, and evaluate and modify the process (remain in control), there is far more commitment, energy, satisfaction, and impact associated with the experience." This assumption suggests that the first step in staff development should be a needs assessment in which teachers are offered an opportunity to inventory, prioritize and make explicit their own professional needs. Staff development activities that proceed from such an explication of needs are assumed to be highly relevant to the client teachers and, therefore, also to have a large chance of success in changing teaching behaviors and improving learning.

6. A school-wide faculty group is the appropriate unit with which to

work when involving teachers in such a planning process. This assumption suggests that the whole is greater than the sum of the parts; the word staff in "staff development" denotes an aggregate of individuals who work together for a common goal. Because the staff members share the common goal of instruction in the school and because their cooperation is essential to accomplishing this goal, it is appropriate to engage the staff, as a group, in the process of planning and implementing their staff development activities.

7. A school's faculty can be involved in such a process by the use of a Facilitation Team, drawn from outside the school, whose only function is to assist the faculty in planning, implementing, evaluating and following through on its own staff development plan. The identification of professional needs and the planning of inservice activities to meet those needs is a complicated process in which faculty members are typically not trained to engage. Even if trained, groups may have difficulty guiding themselves to reach a consensus on a staff development plan. In the absence of training or guidance, a faculty group may founder on hidden shoals. Premature and inappropriate evaluation of ideas might curtail their full consideration. Goals might be lost to the pressure of the moment. Potentially important ideas that emerge early might be overlooked in subsequent discussions.

To insure that the faculty group proceeds efficiently with its business, a Facilitation Team composed of a facilitator, a recorder, and an observer can be employed. This team, whose members are from outside the school and have no personal stake in the outcome of the process, is trained in techniques of facilitating meetings so that the meeting's goals are achieved. The facilitator moderates the discussion. Focusing on the process, he/she encourages the group to set limits on its own procedures and to stay within

those limits as it consciously pursues its goals. The recorder publically preserves the ideas produced by the group by recording them on butcher paper taped to the walls. The observer watches his/her fellow team members and makes notes for their later consideration. The performance of the observer does not influence the current meeting.

Assumptions Concerning Process of Facilitation

8. For the facilitation process to be successful, teachers must volunteer and willingly participate in it. This assumption of teachers' willing involvement runs through, not only the meeting facilitation process, but the entire staff development effort. Popular opinion in the SRN staff states that, for too long, staff development has consisted of activities laid on teachers by administrators at the school, district and even county levels. Participation is often involuntary and results are negligible. The SRN staff sees a causual relationship here and believes that teachers' willing involvement is the first requisite to success. This was repeated a number of times during facilitator training sessions when one or another of the trainees would say, "Teachers should not be a captive audience."

9. The faculty group must agree to and feel comfortable with participatory decision-making. Extending the assumption of willing participation further, the teachers must clearly understand that this process requires that they participate actively as individuals, that they make an effort to inform the opinions of others in the group, that they are, in turn, open to being informed by them, and that they will abide by and even support the decisions of the group once completed. During a facilitator training session one trainee observed that he believes it is important that the group "buy into the process of participatory decision-making for if they don't, the whole model will fall down." This comment seemed to capture and

reinforce a basic assumption of the facilitation process.

10. During the facilitation process, as needs are identified, they often emerge in layers. Initial problem statements are often cursory and periphiral to the group. More central needs tend to emerge as the group works through its various agendas and comes to focus on areas of substance. During a facilitator training session a trainer stated, "The problem that people tell you they have is usually not the problem that they're really concerned about. The initial problems are seldom the real problems. It's always a layer on a layer on a layer which gets down to the fundamental question." This process takes time and interaction. It is this assumption that supports the use of a group level, efficiently facilitated meeting instead of individually completed questionnaires for needs assessment.

11. The facilitator's function is to assist the group in defining its own needs and seeking solutions by opening communication. As an SRN staff member observed, "the process (facilitation) team is trying to facilitate communication or open up communication." The facilitator insures the rules are observed so that all members have equal opportunity to participate, the group stays on task, and it completes its work within the alloted time. Clear rules, equal participation and task orientation are the central concern of the facilitator.

12. The facilitator should not be concerned with the content of the meeting. His/her function is not to provide either problems or solutions. During a mid-year facilitator training session a facilitator raised for discussion the difficulty encountered when she felt the need to provide more information to the school staff. In response to this a trainer observed, "We have told people from the beginning of the training that their role is to be that of facilitator, not that of a consultant." The clear message

was that the facilitator should not get into the position of providing answers. At another point the trainer stated that, in her opinion, "it was not the role of the facilitator to evaluate, but simply to ask the right questions."

Examination of the SRN Facilitation Team Approach

This research project had three tasks: (1) to describe the actual staff development program characterized by the Facilitation Team approach, (2) to test the effects of this program on its client teachers, and (3) to analyze the assumptions of new staff development models, as exemplified in the SRN Facilitation Team approach. These three research tasks were undertaken by a team from the Department of Education, University of California, Santa Barbara. The five member team included two university faculty members and three graduate students who were experienced teachers on leave from the classroom to pursue graduate work. Using school teachers to comprise the majority of the research team was an intentional effort to ground the perspective of the research project in the reality of public schools. Further, it was anticipated that entry into school settings for observation and data collection would be easier for people accustomed to those settings.

In order to investigate this process, the initial (needs assessment) work of Facilitation Teams at nine different schools was observed. Three schools were then chosen to be primary research sites at which the Facilitation Team process would be followed to its conclusion. To follow this process, the research team used a variety of data gathering techniques including semifocused observations, structured interviews and questionnaires. The reasons for selecting the three chosen primary sites and the specifics of the research project's data gathering and analysis methods are presented in Appendix A.

A Contrasting Approach to Staff Development: The Shopping List

Often, when attempting to understand a phenomenon, it is helpful to contrast it with another phenomenon of a similar sort but possessing different specific characteristics. Botanist describe new species of plants by comparing them to known species. Concert goers describe a newly debuted musical composition by comparing it to the work of known composers. In these cases, the aim of the comparison is not to determine which phenomenon is better but to use the one as a background against which to highlight and understand the other.

In the current project it was decided that a more complete understanding of the Facilitation Team Approach could be achieved by contrasting it with a second approach to staff development which SRN was using with teachers in its service area. Beginning in 1978, SRN had offered to individual teachers the opportunity to participate in topical workshops aimed at a variety of teacher needs. Each Fall, SRN circulated to all Ventura and Santa Barbara County teachers a "Shopping List" containing titles of over 100 separate inservice workshops that could be offered to interested teachers. Teachers were encouraged to check off those workshops which they would like to attend and return the list to SRN for tabulation. Using this data, SRN identified mutually held needs and then organized appropriate two-hour workshops to be held after school and which were open, at minimal cost, to any area teacher.

These workshops differed from the Facilitation Team Approach in at least one fundamental respect. They were focused around a specific topic as the unit of organization, rather than a specific school building. In being so organized, these workshops attracted teachers from a variety of schools--indeed even school districts. This was not the case with the

Facilitation Teams, which were organized around the school site, with the teachers in attendance being only from the site. The implications of this organizational arrangement will be discussed later in this report.

Two Shopping List workshops were selected for contrast with the three Facilitation Team staff development activities. These workshops were selected because they focused on concerns similar to those identified by the three faculty groups with whom the Facilitation Teams worked. In both cases the topic was "Teacher Stress and Burnout." These workshops were observed and a number of participants interviewed by the research staff. The focus of these interviews was the process during and the effects of the workshop. (See Appendix A for more detail concerning research methodology.)

Results

In the remainder of this document, we will review the principal findings, focusing upon the Team Facilitation process amd, where practical and appropriate, placing that information in the context of the shopping list workshops. The main findings will center around (a) the differing nature of teachers' professional needs, and how that entered into the development process, (b) some of the effects of the Facilitation Team approach, (c) some of the difficulties which teachers experienced with the Facilitation Team approach, and (d) some school-wide issues affecting the outcomes of the Facilitation Team approach. In the last section of the paper, we'll focus upon conclusions and implications.

A Focus on Different Natures of Teachers' Needs

The first step in the SRN Facilitation Team approach was to send teams to requesting schools for the purpose of helping faculties to engage in needs assessment. As the research project staff observed the team's work with faculties at various schools it became apparent that the needs

identified via the Facilitation Team process were of a substantially different nature than those at which the "Shopping List" workshops were aimed. The first school observed was Adams*, a K-6 elementary school. Here, the primary staff development need that emerged from the initial meeting was the review and adoption of a coordinated reading program across the grades. In the second school observed, Burr Elementary, the faculty expressed a need to bring the upper grade teachers together and initiate cooperation and an integrated curriculum in the manner that the lower grade teachers at that school had apparently already achieved. It would then be possible to coordinate and articulate the curriculum between the upper and lower grades. In Coolidge Elementary, the third school in which the project staff observed an SRN Facilitation Team conduct a needs assessment meeting, no needs emerged. This was an interesting case about which more will be said later in the report. The fourth school faculty visited by the project staff, Douglas Junior High, identified as their primary need an increase in trust, both among the faculty members and between the faculty and the administration.

None of the products of these needs identification processes were specific to individual teachers at the classroom level. Instead, they were needs shared by teachers as groups, transcending individual classrooms to include a number of grade levels or even the entire school. These were essentially the needs of groups, not of individuals.

The needs at which the shopping list workshops were aimed were quite different. They appear to be the needs of individuals. The workshops did not tend to focus on school-wide issues such as articulation of curriculum across grades or school-wide policies for discipline or parential involvement, as did many which grew out of the Facilitation Team approach. Instead, teachers who participated in these workshops appeared to be seeking ful-

*All institution or individual names used in this report are fictional.

fillment of needs which were indeed professional in nature but which also were held at the individual level.

"Shopping List" workshops typically offered two basic types of topics. The first type was intended to meet teachers' curricular needs as viewed at the classroom level. These workshops offered teachers suggestions for improving learning activities in their classrooms related to particular curricular or content areas. Examples include "Teaching Music Without a Specialist," "Social Studies Projects for Students," "Art with Found Objects," "Science Activities, Experiments and Projects," and "Mathematics Problem Solving." The other type of workshop typically offered via the "Shopping List" was intended to meet teachers' needs for useful instructional techniques that could be used across content areas. Examples of these workshops include "Five Classroom Management Techniques That Work," "Dealing with Anger in the Classroom," "Teaching to Left and Right Hemispheres," "Assertive Discipline," and "Turning Waiting Time into Learning Time" (see Appendix B). Whether the workshop topics were content specific or offered techniques useful across the curriculum, the large majority offered attending teachers specific recommendations which, if adopted, would result in observable changes in teaching and learning behaviors within the classroom.

The "Shopping List" did contain a few workshop topics that were of an entirely different type. These workshops did not aim at classroom level teaching and learning behaviors but, instead, focused on more personal needs that teachers expressed. Of the 81 workshops offered by SRN in the 1980-81 school year, 13 workshops on four different topics which met these more personally held needs were requested and offered. The topics were "Alternative Careers for Educators," "Teacher's Rights: Education and the Law," "Teacher Stress and Burnout," and "Time Management Systems." In all

cases, however, when selecting from the shopping list, teachers appeared to be responding to concerns with their own classrooms, their own pupils or themselves as professionals.

On the whole, it appeared that different processes for providing staff development--in this case either allowing individual teachers to select from a "Shopping List" of alternative activities or facilitating meetings in which faculty groups identify needs and plan staff development activities to meet those needs--might focus on different types of teachers' needs. In addition to the needs generated with nine schools wherein we observed the Facilitation Teams, we were able to gain access to a list of the needs that were identified at 16 other schools which used the Facilitation Team approach. A few of these needs could be classified as individual needs expressed at the single classroom level such as "Encouraging self-directed students," "general teaching methods," and "use of Madeline Hunter methods." The large majority, however, were clearly group needs which transcended the individual classroom level. Most were expressed as belonging to the entire school. Examples include "teacher morale, "inter-faculty communication," "reading and language programs across grade levels," "co-operation among faculty," "school-wide discipline," "trust," "grade level consistency" and "teacher-to-teacher visitations." These differed from the needs generated in the shopping list process. Clearly, the two processes for initiating staff development did tend to focus on different types of teachers' professional needs.

Recall that one of the assumptions guiding the SRN facilitation process was that teacher change is more likely to occur if the change is perceived as meeting the teacher's felt needs. We were curious to learn if the Shopping List or the Facilitation Team approach were perceived as satisfying

these needs better than the other.

To seek an answer to this question we turned to an examination of the data obtained from the structured interviews (see Appendix C) conducted with forty-four teachers who had been involved in the SRN Facilitation Process. These teachers were asked what purpose they saw "staff development" serving--in the abstract and philosophically, not tied specifically to any one sponsor such as SRN.

Staff development to meet individual needs. The role of staff development serving the needs of individual teachers and the individual problems they had to solve was clearly evident throughout our interviews. For example, the comment by an elementary teacher that staff development "needs to be individualized because people have different needs" was relatively common. For such teachers, the ability and freedom to choose the staff development activities of most importance to them was paramount. These teachers didn't feel that being forced to attend workshops in areas not of their choice was a useful activity, but rather detracted from them satisfying the specific and individual needs. Another elementary teacher illustrated this when she said that to her, staff development was "taking a workshop in an area I want to know more about or am required to know about."

These areas in which individual needs were present usually pertained to classroom instruction and the activities directly supportive of classroom instruction. Teachers supportive of the idea of staff development as an activity to benefit individual teachers viewed that benefit as pertaining to what the teacher does in the classroom. An elementary teacher told us that "staff development is useful to the extent that it applies to the classroom, either in the content or the management of the class." Other teachers indicated similar patterns of belief, as noted below:

> If activities are not fucused on the person's grade level, then staff development is not useful.
>
> The purpose of staff development is to become a better teacher in the classroom.
>
> Good staff development helps teachers do better jobs with their students. Motivation of students, discipline, and improving of teaching and teaching techniques (all would be included).

Finally, one teacher, aware of the fact that much staff development concerns issues other than those directly related to classroom environments, noted that:

> Some people are going into meditation and that's OK. I'd rather see it on the level of classroom activities.

Staff development to meet school wide needs. Not all teachers viewed staff development as a classroom related phenomenon specific to the needs of individual teachers. Indeed, a number of teachers interviewed thought of staff development as a broadly based activity serving the needs of the entire school professional staff. In this framework, staff development is not meant to cater only to the idiosyncratic needs of individual teachers, but rather is meant to address issues that cut across individuals and thus concern the professional staff. One teacher summarized quite succinctly this view of staff development when he said:

> Staff development involves the concept of a staff -- a group of people. That's very idealistic though, it doesn't always work that way.

Another teacher, noting the difference between in-service and staff development, concluded that staff development by definition had to involve the entire staff working together to solve problems of mutual (not individual concern). This secondary teacher stated:

> We've had lots of in-service but not staff development. (In-Service) focuses upon what to do about a particular problem, while staff development focuses upon getting the staff as a whole to work together.

In many ways, those teachers who saw staff development as involving the staff working collectively to solve collective problems seemed to be advocating staff development in a much more literal sense than those teachers who advocated it solving individual problems at the classroom level. Not only was the collective nature of the term staff emphasized in this definition, but the focus upon development was strong as well. Here, teachers were much more prone to see collective efforts as developmental efforts, as process, as working towards solutions rather than finding immediate solutions. Such a conclusion emerges from teacher statements such as the following:

> Staff development includes what holds a faculty together -- it's how a faculty can improve.
>
> I think of process kinds of things...when people go through these kinds of experiences together, things begin to happen.
>
> The purpose of staff development is to make the staff a more cohesive force academically and socially.

To some extent, these two positions, serving personal and group needs, illustrate two ends of a continuum representing what constitutes staff development. As we might expect, other teachers located themselves at various stages between these points. Many teachers seem to have arrived at a decision that staff development really must be viewed both expansively and specifically -- that is it must include individual needs at the same time it serves the needs of the staff. To this extent, a number of teachers reported to us opinions such as the following:

> Staff development is any concerted effort by certificated and uncertificated staff to improve the quality of the school.
>
> (Staff development is) something that helps teachers grow, (it is) anything that helps build morale or helps to develop communication.

We received some indication that the presence of these more flexible

conceptualizations of what staff development is have emerged somewhat in recent years. Some teachers told us that they had not always seen staff development as including such activities as communication skills and morale building. Rather, they had always believed staff development to be restricted primarily to classroom specific issues -- instruction, curriculum, and discipline. Yet that belief was changing, due in part to the "incredible problems" (as one teacher put it) facing schools today. This therefore meant that staff development may be coming to be seen as one vehicle by which some problems such as low morale and poor communications can be addressed. While there was far from conclusive evidence on this point, the trend in this direction bears watching.

One clear-cut conclusion then which we can reach is that the term "staff development" does not have the same meaning to all those teachers to whom we talked over the past year. To some the term carries with it classroom specific activities, to others it connotes a broad based range of developmental activities. To still others, a combination of these factors exist.

The needs and success of staff development. Such conceptual issues seem important for the manner in which teachers came to see the extent to which staff development activities were currently "successful" for them (Question #5 on Exhibit 3, Appendix C). Teachers who viewed staff development as satisfying primarily the needs of individual teachers, and who could avail themselves of opportunities to meet those needs, tended to see staff development as being successful. As one teacher said, "I actively seek out the activity I like and think will be useful and I will go wherever I have to go to find it." On the other hand, teachers who saw staff development as involving the entire staff on on-going school issues but who had

concluded that such was not the direction of their school's staff development effort, often were disenchanted about the utility of staff development. One elementary teacher termed SD at his school as "mediocre, lacking content, consistency, and continuity." Still others who saw the collective effort as working at their school and who favored such an approach tended to be more positive. Thus:

> Staff development is working because our school has fostered a sense of community that enables people to use each other as resources to work together.

One more portion of the data collected in this project can shed light on the issue of differing types of teachers' needs, that is the data from the questionnaires (see Exhibit 3, Appendix C). The teachers (N = 99 teachers) were asked to respond on a 5-point agree/disagree scale to two specific statements related to this issue: "1. When I think of good 'staff development,' I think of things I can use immediately in my classroom." and "2. When I think of good 'staff development,' I think of promoting better communication/morale in our school."

The respondents' reactions to these two questions were different, but not substantially so. (For a complete listing of the results from the questionnaires, see Appendix D.) With 1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree, the mean response to item #1 was 4.22 and the mean response to item #2 was 3.91. This suggests that teachers who responded to the questionnaire valued classroom level development activities slighly more than those aimed at broader school-level needs. The standard deviations of these response patterns (1.15 and 1.09, respectively) indicate that the respondents were not united, that a relatively large variance in their opinions existed.

The data from question #6, an open-ended question asking respondents to "Please list your most pressing professional needs below," gives us more

insight into the needs held by teachers. Of the ninety-nine teachers who returned the questionnaire, 63 responded to this question by listing 141 "pressing professional needs." One hundred thirty-three of these could be labeled individually held, classroom level needs. Examples include, "What to do with slower kids," "More time to prepare," "Science ideas and activities," "Completing those areas needing to be taught within the daily time allotted," "Dealing with wild rowdy behavior," "To have more time to express my creative ability," "Learn interesting movement games/songs," and "Feeling good about teaching."

Of the 141 needs listed by the teachers, only eight transcended the individual classroom to represent wide, group-level concerns. Examples of these include "Have a school grade level meeting," "Getting together with other teachers in district," "Uniform campus rules," "Reevaluating our curriculum at secondary level" and "staff morale...needs for positive feelings of worth, more cohesiveness and appreciation for each other's ideas."

Clearly, when given the opportunity to list their most pressing professional needs, the respondents tended to nominate individually held, classroom level needs instead of group held, school wide needs. While it would appear that these individual needs are highest in priority, we could not say that group needs are not important to respondents. Their answers to questions #1 and #2, cited above, indicate an importance for this second type of need as well.

A further look at subgroups of this data reveals some interesting tendencies. Twenty-six of the respondents had attended in-service activity via the "Shopping List" process while twenty-five took part in the needs assessment process facilitates by SRN teams. (The remaining 48 respondents were involved in neither type of staff development activity during this

school year.) The responses of these two groups to questions #1 and #2 on staff development are offered in Table 1.

Table 1

Responses to Questions #1 and #2 by Staff Development Process Attended by Respondent

	"Facilitation" Process	"Shopping List" Process
Item #1: Immediate Classroom Needs	$\bar{X}$ = 4.16 s.d. = 1.14	$\bar{X}$ = 4.61 s.d. = 0.75
Item #2: Schoolwide Communication/Morale	$\bar{X}$ = 4.32 s.d. = 0.90	$\bar{X}$ = 3.27 s.d. = 1.00

As can be seen in Table 1, "Shopping List" attendees responded more positively to question #1 which identified staff development with individual classroom needs and less positively to question #2 which identified it with school-wide issues. The inverse was the case for those who participated in the facilitated needs assessment process.

No cause-effect relationship should be inferred from these data. Teachers might have chosen and then appreciated the "Shopping List" process because they were more concerned with individual needs. On the other hand, their view of staff development might have been shaped by their participation in the "Shopping List" workshop. Which came first is unclear, as it also is with those who participated in facilitated needs assessment. What is clear, here as in the previously discussed interview data, is that opinion of what staff development should be vary with the types of professional needs held by teachers. When all our data are taken together, it would appear that individual, classroom level needs assume highest priority for most of the teachers in our sample but that many also appear concerned

about group, school-wide needs as well.

B. Focus on Beneficial Effects of Facilitated Staff Development Process

The process we have been labeling "Facilitated Staff Development" was, in fact, a four-step process, the first step of which was a needs assessment activity which involved a whole school faculty and was facilitated by a trained team provided by SRN. The next steps in the process were to include the planning of staff development activities designed to meet the identified needs, conducting such activities, and evaluating their impact. All of these were steps in which teachers were expected to participate. To focus on the effects of this staff development process the research staff examined it's data collected (1) during observation of the needs assessment and planning activities, (2) during observation of ensuing workshops, (3) from interviews of participants in the staff development activity, and (4) via questionnaires completed by teachers who had and who had not participated in such a process. (See Appendix A for more detail concerning research methodology.)

We will first turn to an examination of the results from the structured interviews, specifically the question, "To what extent is the school any different than it was before the process took place?" We found here, as with many of the other questions, considerable variety in responses. We also found possibly more than with any of the other questions, differences between schools. Some respondents felt that the process had a beneficial effect, some believed it to have an effect but one whose value was questionable, and some felt the process was of little if any consequence.

Substantive changes in policy or practice. Those who felt that the facilitation process led to changes in the school described these changes in two categories. First were what might be termed "substantive changes"--

that is, changes characterized by substantive alterations in school policy or practice, such as in curriculum, teaching practice, discipline, and the like. Thus, at one school in particular, we see that the facilitation process led to workshops on how to structure parent-conferences as well as a relatively set plan on what issues would be covered in future minimum day activities. In fact, the actual proviso that the school be granted a larger number of minimum days was itself a major victory which teachers collectively requested of the administration as a result of the initial facilitation process:

> One thing led to another, the superintendent came, we were listened to, we got a minimum day which we feel good about.

Changes in school climate. Of those who believed the SRN's Facilitation process to be beneficial, most by far noted its consequences in a more general sense. That is, they didn't mention specific substantive changes such as policy changes or alterations in schedules, essentially because such changes had not occurred. Rather what had happened was the creation of an atmosphere of greater "trust" and more "open" communication, which informants saw as useful in and of itself. As an example, 11 of the 25 respondents to the follow-up questionnaire who had participated in the SRN Facilitation process indicated that the process "resulted in improved morale among the staff."

Some teachers noted a potential for more long-term benefits which emerged out of this change of climate, but more often than not the end product was seen to be the experience itself and the "good feelings" created as a result. Thus, during interviews, teachers observed:

> People are more open. Trust was built up because we acted on their input.

> The process was useful though it had nothing to do with the classroom...it did allow us to re-affirm old friendships.

> The fact that everyone was involved in identifying and planning was useful.
>
> It was really important to trust the fact that people really know what they want. Just validating that fact was very important to me.

We see through these and other statements that the SRN Facilitation process did not have to produce immediate results in order to have value to some of the participants. Highly valued was the fact that the process has symbolic significance--that is it represents something of value, such as confidence, trust, the potential for more open communication. That potential does not have to be realized (at least at the moment) for the process to be seen as valuable, but the potential does have to be in an area deemed to be of worth to the participants. One administrator was quite explicit in his point of view on this issue as he saw the process itself serving to legitimate the school more in the eyes of the district administration who felt the administration would see the school as structuring some viable change activities at the school because formalized staff development was scheduled and because the school had, as a result of the initial SRN facilitation meeting, received some state funds to carry on with more staff development in the next year.

Colleague interaction. An additional benefit of SRN's facilitation process appears for many teachers to be the opportunity it afforded them to talk about substantive issues with their colleagues. The typical lack of communication among teachers was cited by many informants in the interview sessions as a serious impediment to professional staff development and, by extension, to the professional in general. Here we are talking specifically of the extent to which teachers feel they are working alone, without the advantage of colleague support, and the conditions minimizing this isolation by creating networks of teachers working collectively on common

problems. One of the conditions that may serve to ease this isolation is staff development, properly conceived to serve this purpose. The SRN facilitation process was seen by many, but not all participants, to serve such a purpose.

That working alone is a problem identified by many teachers was clear in many of our interviews. As one teacher said, "it's a shame that teachers are so isolated. Its too bad they don't share more with each other." Another said that her job was "a loner" and that "I wish it wasn't." The principal of an elementary school was quite clear in his recognition of the problem and his unwillingness to accept the condition as permanent. He noted:

> We live in a school...in a compact kind of space. Schools tend to have everyone isolated, and people relate at superficial levels. This is not acceptable to me.

The advantage of such sharing to overcome this isolation was seen to serve both instrumental and socio-emothional purposes. Instrumental purposes were served when closer and more frequent contact provided a sharing of ideas and thus minimized what one teacher indicated was an ongoing problem, the absence of communication about techniques and strategies that work well. A significant number of teachers noted how infrequently they were able to work with colleagues involved in similar kinds of work. As one teacher in the language arts noted,

> Teachers are involved in a multiplicity of curricula beyond the language arts, I would love (for example) to work with another reading teacher, but that will never happen.

Yet far and away the most important rationale for minimizing the effects of teachers working in isolated environments was the socio-emotional one. Such a rationale stressed the "we" feeling that many wanted to see a school have -- the feeling that, as one administrator said, "We

are a unit with common goals." Teachers who expressed such concerns were quite clear on this issue, as illustrated by one elementary teacher who said:

> I wish the outcome (of staff development) were more of a social understanding, group participation kind of arrangement -- things that would draw the faculty together rather than draw them apart. That's what we should be talking about when we say staff development, rather than in-service or personal development.

Thus, good staff development, according to some teachers, needs to be oriented more toward facilitating collectively (a theme we identified in the previous section). Consequently

> Successful staff development includes an opportunity to socialize and (work in) small group settings.

This in turn requires

> A change in focus, to what we can do together. The focus up until now has been upon what individuals can do in their classes but not upon what we can do together as a faculty.

Clearly, many teachers felt that the SRN Facilitation Process helped to encourage communication among the faculty, a first step in promoting collegiality. Twenty-two of the 25 respondents to the follow-up questionnaire who had participated in the Process indicated that it "...resulted in improved communication among the staff." In interviews teachers noted that the process allowed a lot of issues to be aired.

> We've always been a vocal and sharing group. The process was able to get more information in less time than some other method.

Speaking of a follow-up session that rose out of the facilitation process, a secondary teacher said:

> The experience was excellent in building increased communication and discussion among faculty members.

Still another at the same school said,

> Working in small groups like at the retreat is helpful because people slowly began to talk more about what they felt rather than just mumbling to themselves.

Finally, re-affirming the value of the collective approach in solidifying the faculty:

> It allowed us to re-affirm old friendships. That's important because teachers are very isolated, they all work in separate departments and seldom have a chance to talk to each other.

The open nature of the needs assessment process. Most teachers favored the open process encouraged by the facilitation model--the extent to which the agenda was relatively open during the meetings which ensued and the manner in which all staff members had the opportunity to express their point of view. The fact that the process "allows everyone to be heard" was well documented, and thus represented the majority viewpoint of the teachers to whom we talked.

A second and equally important dimension of the SRN process is the aspect of it that encourages diversity of opinion in an environment in which those individuals moderating the meeting are not sitting in a position of judgement of the process and the input of the participants. Facilitation moderators were in fact seen as relatively neutral in their official capacity, and few if any were ever criticized for appearing to favor one particular point of view over another, or in stiffling the opinion of staff members. Thus the fact that it "depersonalized" issues so that all individuals could put forth their own agendas without fear was highly valued.

In summary, many teachers saw benefit from participation in the SRN Facilitation Process. The benefits perceived by individual teachers varied from specific substantive changes in policy or practice in their schools to more general improvement of the climate in which they teach, including increase in trust or morale and a promotion of collegial interaction.

C. Focus on Difficulties with Facilitated Staff Development Process

Yet the process was "boring" according to some participants and this tended to turn some people off, creating a significant minority in each school who would not participate. Because of this non-response rate, some teachers wondered if the process was really that effective. If for example, there is the same minority who refuses to become involved in generating ideas for solutions to school-wide problems, but who, nevertheless, stand in the way of solutions that are proposed, has the process actually accomplished that much? More than one teacher seemed in support of the following comment,

> Some people do not like in-service and will not participate no matter what.

Other comments along the same line were more direct and blunt,

> There are no strengths in this process because we have people here who have real concerns and deep-seated needs but they won't talk about them in a large group...and they certainly wouldn't want them written down and posted up around a room.

As is clear from the above comments, not all teachers who participated in the process reported deriving benefits from it. Many felt it produced no significant change in the structure or the climate of the school. That this category included a surprisingly large number of teachers in the three schools in which we pursued our data collection is an understandable result of the process by which we selected the schools to pursue. At this point it is important for the reader to understand that process.

Recall that the research staff had initiated observation in nine schools at the beginning of the school year, this in hopes of selecting two that could be followed through the year. In only four of these schools, Douglas Junior High, and Edison, Franklin and Grant Elementary, was the initial needs assessment activity followed by a request to SRN to assist in

organization of a staff development program aimed at the identified needs. The other four schools did not initiate any contact with SRN requesting further help. This lack of follow-up requests appeared to the research staff as an unexpected development and one not consistent with SRN's expectations. Two of these four schools did, in fact, proceed on their own with a staff development program which appeared to spring from the SRN facilitated needs assessment. These were Adams and Hamilton Elementary. One school, Burr Elementary, did not make any effort, beyond the initial listing of needs, to provide any coordinated staff development based on those needs. The last school, Coolidge Elementary, did not even succeed in producing an assessment of needs though they did attempt the effort using an SRN Facilitation Team.

For the research staff, the schools in which no activities followed the initial needs assessment effort were as important for understanding the process of staff development as were the schools in which all went according to SRN's expectations. It was therefore decided to choose not two but three schools to pursue through the year, one in which further SRN help was solicited and used to build and conduct a staff development program (Douglas Junior High), one in which staff development activities grew out of the original SRN facilitated needs assessment but these subsequent activities did not involve SRN (Hamilton Elementary), and one in which no staff development activities followed the initial needs assessment (Burr Elementary).

Thus, when one understands that two of the three schools selected as continuing sites for our research did not utilize SRN services beyond initial needs assessment, the number of informants who reported minimum impact by the process is not at all surprising. What is of interest is why these

two schools stopped the Facilitation Process after the first step--needs assessment--and did not continue by requesting further SRN assistance.

Lack of follow-up. A possible answer to this question may be illustrated by some interview comments of informants in the schools which did not follow through with the process. As one teacher said.

> If the SRN process is to be useful, then the process needs to be continued over time. If just can't be a one-shot thing.

For these people, and a number of others interviewed in these schools, the process was a "one-shot thing." It stopped because somebody else, presumably SRN, did not keep it going. Yet, the SRN staff never planned to take the initiative in continuing development of in-service activities. On the contrary, they saw themselves as a resource that could be tapped by the schools, but only at the schools' initiative. One assumption underlying this process of staff development was the "teachers must be involved in the entire process of planning, implementing, evaluating and following-up the activities." For the SRN staff, this assumption suggested that the teachers should and would, not only be involved, but take the initiative in these activities. In some schools, e.g., Burr and Coolidge, the teachers clearly did not take the initiative. In these schools, in the absence of a clear invitation to become further involved, SRN's presence disappeared.

Possible follow-up role of SRN not understood by teachers. Consideration of why teachers did not initiate further staff development planning following needs assessment reveals two possible explanations. First, and most obvious, they did not know they could. Many teachers, while lamenting the lack of follow-up, clearly assumed that the responsibility for it lay elsewhere. Contrary to this teachers' assumption runs the SRN's assumption that "the SRN Teams' role during needs assessment was facilitation, not

consultation." This caveat was followed strictly by facilitation teams. They scrupulously avoided making suggestions or recommendations to the faculties with which they worked, limiting themselves exclusively to aiding the communication process during needs assessment. This emphasis apparently resulted in an absence of suggestions concerning possible SRN involvement following needs assessment. In many cases, the teachers did not understand that SRN could provide aid in planning a staff development program, securing resources, conducting the activities, and evaluating them. Each side expected and waited for the other to act. Neither did.

This breakdown in communication began to manifest itself in several ways as the school year proceeded. First, SRN did not get as many requests for follow-up assistance as had been expected. This appeared to trouble the SRN staff. As early as October 31, one staff member suggested that a change should be made in the facilitation process, a change which called for the facilitators to "push the involvement of SRN more in the implementation stage." This was essentially a recognition of the need to "advertise" SRN services during the latter stages of needs assessment when the group was moving towards formulating plans for staff development. This SRN staff member also felt that this was not being done now because the facilitation teams were composed of teachers and administrators, trained by SRN but essentially school people. He felt these team members did not feel an allegiance to SRN and so forgot to "push" it.

Lack of "pushing SRN" by facilitation team members seems, however, to have resulted from more than a lack of allegiance. In spite of the growing awareness among the SRN staff of a lack of a follow-up mechanism that would inform teachers of the resources of SRN, by late November, continuing facilitator training did not include recommendations for "SRN pushing." On the

contrary, during a training session a number of facilitator team members expressed an uneasiness with the limitations placed on their behavior by the assumption that they should serve only as facilitators and not as consultants. They sensed the need to offer suggestions to the faculties with which they worked as to how to proceed with planning and executing a staff development program. They would have liked to recommend particular resources, many of which were available through SRN. They began to understand that the process of planning staff development might slow or even stop in the schools in which they facilitated needs assessment meetings if such recommendations were not made. Yet, at this training meeting, the assumption that they were facilitators and not consultants was reinforced by the person contracted by SRN to train them. They were encouraged to adhere to the process as originally conceived. This appears to be a case in which allegiance to one of SRN's original assumptions interferred with achievement of its goals.

Lack of early involvement of teachers in the process. There is a second possible explanation of why teachers did not initiate further staff development planning following needs assessment in Hamilton and Burr Elementary schools. Another of SRN's assumptions stated that, "Teachers are more likely to change their professional behaviors if they are involved in the process of planning, implementing, evaluating and following-up for activities." The validity of this assumption was continually supported by the teachers with whom we talked. Again and again, when speaking of staff development activities, teachers expressed resentment at having to attend staff development activities when they (the teachers) have had little control over the nature of the activity, its format, or its ultimate use. Indeed, if there is any one conclusion that could be drawn from this study and to

which virtually all teachers would agree, such would be the conclusion.

To illustrate further, note the following comments:

From a secondary teacher, who said,

> I worked at _____ for 13 years; the principal there runs a very tight ship. He makes all of the decisions. For three years he forced Madeline Hunter down our throats. It certainly didn't come from the requests of the staff.

Another teacher at the same school said,

> I have no interest in about 80% of what we attend as staff development, and we have no say in the content of that staff development.

An elementary teacher, in discussing examples of particularly poor staff development, said that the district-wide continuum of skills was not well received by teachers when implemented via a member of district-wide training sessions. Why?

> The reason why this experience turned out not to be good or useful is because outside people came in and told us what we needed.

This attitude emerged because many teachers believed that staff development that is managed by others or without the input of those affected will be carried out from a point of view other than that held by the teacher. Thus many teachers subscribed to the position made clear by one teacher that "if a teacher attends meetings which he has not chosen, then that staff development is not useful." This may seem like somewhat of an over-simplification, but we received the distinct impression from many teachers with whom we talked that they had been "burnt" too often on staff development activities that someone else wanted <u>for</u> teachers without having first considered working <u>with</u> teachers to solve these problems. Again, the remarks speak for themselves:

> Staff development is being forced on us by downtown; someone perceived us as lacking, all of this came from above, all of this is a waste of my time.

> The most formidible obstacle in the development of successful staff development is having staff development defined <u>for</u> us rather than <u>by</u> us.

It is, of course, precisely this issue of teacher involvement that the SRN Facilitation Process was designed to address. Clearly, SRN intended that teachers be more than involved, that they be the guiding force behind staff development in the schools in which the process was implemented. In some of those schools this intent appeared to be accomplished. Teachers with whom we talked appreciated the fact that, during the facilitated needs assessment process, "people listened to us," that there seemed to be no restrictions on what topics could be considered for discussion. This in turn seemed to have led to an "upbeat" feeling on the part of many staff members. People realized that they did have input and that fact in and of itself was valued. One teacher commented on the presence of such a phenomenon in her district "as it sometimes is quite rare."

Unfortunately, these feelings were not shared by all the teachers with whom we talked. Many related that the suspicion and doubt that they felt for most staff development activities marked the SRN Facilitation Process as well. A goodly number of teachers were suspicious of the intents, unsure of its origins, and not sufficiently involved in the anticipated outcomes. Because of this, there appears to have been, in many cases, a fair amount of negativity surrounding the SRN process, and a subsequent reticence to either become involved in it or to take it seriously.

Apparently, in some schools, little preparation was made for the initial needs assessment activity. First, the decision to engage in the SRN process was often made by the principal with no consultation with the teachers. In more than one case the principal's decision to invite SRN appears to have been the result of his need to demonstrate to superiors that his school had

or was working toward a staff development plan. Second, in many schools, similar needs assessment activities had been conducted the previous year, often to comply with state of federal funding requirements, and had produced no demonstrable results perceptable to the teachers. Third, the purpose of the SRN facilitated needs assessment meeting was often not clear to teachers before they entered the room. Their attendance was required, a result of a call by the principal, and their only reason for attendance was compliance.

Into this environment came the SRN Facilitation Team, primed to make the teachers the center of the planning process, to create a staff development program taylored to the specific needs of the faculty. With these best of intentions, these teams often encountered hostility. As one teacher said,

> I arrived (at the initial meeting) hostile. I assumed that this was just something else I was going to have to do. I really didn't understand why it's necessary to develop any more when we're already so developed.

Another teacher observed,

> A weakness of the SRN process is that there needs to be better communication from those involved with planning and the rest of the staff about what would be happening at the meeting, what the agenda would be.

The conclusion that many people were unclear as to the nature of the meeting, and the fact that the SRN process almost always "is initiated by the principal," is obvious because to many teachers, "we knew at the initial meeting that we had to do it." Thus absence of choice seems to have bred some resistance to the SRN process, making the overcoming of this resistance necessary if the substantive issues raised were to be confronted.

Lack of consideration of time and timing. A number of teachers cited other possible reasons for the failure of the SRN Facilitation Process to take hold and result in viable staff development. Many of these reasons

are not specific to the SRN Process but are seen by the teachers to be typical difficulties of most staff development efforts. As an example, when we review teachers comments about the consequences of the SRN Facilitation Process the dimension of time and timing continues to reappear. Teachers are very suspicious of "one-shot" staff development activities and/or those that do not exist within the context of some continuing set of issues. As we have noted earlier, they have been through similar processes before and if results are not specified in advance, then they (the teachers) place little value in the process that, as an elementary teacher said, is primarily

> time passing -- an afternoon of short-term adrenalin shots that are literally short term. Its very exacting that afternoon but the next morning you may or may not follow through with it.

Another teacher at a different school echoed what by now is a familiar refrain,

> one-shot in-services often lead to a lack of commitment. There is more said than done in most staff development. It should be a continuing process, a commitment to a history and a future.

As was observed earlier, when teachers were not made aware of the range of possibilities, including the possibility of continued and sustained support, offered by SRN, they saw the activity as just another "one-shot" affair. This was especially apparent in the schools that scheduled SRN Facilitation meetings as vehicles for preparing applications for state funds for further staff development. In certain cases, this led to staff development serving as a means to secure funds for further staff development, a purpose which was unclear to the participating teachers. One teacher penetrated to the heart of the issue when she noted that the SRN process at her school was "putting the cart before the horse." She continued:

> The emphasis was, well we can get this money (then) let's figure out how to use it.

A principal admitted that the SRN process was used to pursue funds. He noted "there is not much money to do a good staff development program. That's why the (state money) is so critical. This in turn may lead to comments such as the following by one teacher who directed his remarks at staff development that has no obvious purpose or product:

> What we need is administration development. They are responsible for the interference.

Also related to the dimension of time and timing is the time at which the SRN facilitated staff development meetings were held. Most teachers to whom we talked clearly indicated that staff development without release time was totally ineffectual because it occurred after a full day's teaching, thereby at a time when the energy level of the staff was at a low point. Comments such as the following thus were not uncommon:

> Staff development should be done on release time. If the kids leave school at 3:00 and some in-service starts at 3:05, where's your head at?

> Timing is important. We once had a workshop on movement put on by energetic, skilled people. Teachers who were tired and resistant were told to feel free. What they really wanted was a cold beer!

Some teachers were even of the opinion that minimum days created the same effect, that more time was necessary, as one teacher noted,

> Having workshops on a minimum day schedule is not very appealing. One feels rushed and often the topics are inappropriate.

The time devoted to the first needs assessment meeting was also an issue for some teachers. Many felt that the meetings were quite rushed and thus inadequate for the purpose they were intended to serve. Remembering that most of the initial problem-generating meetings were held after-school, and lasted for the most part no longer than two hours, the production of an

agenda for future meetings by the end of this initial meeting was quite a task to be accomplished. It is no wonder then that we heard comments such as the following,

> The weakness of the approach is that there simply wasn't enough time. We were under incredible time pressures and we didn't have enough time to work through all of the suggestions made.

> The time was too short: there simply was not enough time. When I left the meeting, I wasn't sure what would be done with the information.

This, coupled with, as we noted earlier, the fact that such meetings violated one of the general tenents teachers expressed to us -- that staff development not be held at times when the staff is unreceptive to it (e.g., after school), make comments such as the following more understandable. Commenting on his reaction to the initial facilitation process at his school, this teacher noted,

> It was late in the afternoon and the teachers were all tired. Any time you want to keep teachers late after they've been teaching, you'd better be good.

D. Large Problems Beyond the Reach of SRN

Finally, many informants cited larger problems surrounding public schools as partial explanations of the difficulties encountered by the SRN Facilitation Process. These problems include poor communication, teacher lay-offs and staff reduction, cuts in funding for needs support programs, lack of leadership, the problems with families, television and the like. As one teacher said, the SRN Process

> was a futile gesture considering the scope of the problems that we did identify

Many commented that the present efforts toward staff development were useful, but that problems unaffected by staff development were those that

affected teachers the most. More than one person commented that the present efforts toward staff development are a sign of the times, noting that

> When I first started teaching there was no need for this type of meeting (SRN) because staff development was pleasant and constructuve. (Now) paranoid feelings are growing.

Perhaps most direct was the comment made by a secondary teacher, who said candidly to our interviewer

> What people like the place you're working for ought to do is save all that money that they're using on workshops and looking at workshops and put it into teachers' salaries.

Summary and Discussion

The Ventura-Santa Barbara County School Resource Network (SRN) attempted to employ a process for staff development which it hoped would overcome many of the problems which traditionally plague in-service teacher education. This process would use local school personnel, trained as meeting facilitators, to involve teachers in the planning and implementation of their own staff development activities. After a year of using their process, it is apparent that SRN achieved some rather noteworthy successes in selected schools. It is also apparent, however, that the same process met with only partial success or even failure in other schools in its attempt to build viable and effective staff development programs. This research project examined these experiences in an effort to better understand both their effects on teachers and, where possible, factors that appear to mediate those effects.

Specifically, the project first identified the assumptions held by SRN about what an effective staff development activity should be. It then described selected staff development activities conducted by SRN which were supposedly based on those assumptions. It finally attempted to understand

the experiences' effects on the client teachers in terms of those assumptions. Did the assumptions professed by SRN serve as guides to the development and implementation of the process? Where they did, were the desired results obtained? Where they did not, why was this the case? What was the result of their not being used?

Teachers Involvement in Planning

The fifth assumption of the facilitation process--"teachers must be involved in the entire process of planning, implementing, evaluating and following-up staff development activities"--and the eighth assumption--"teachers must volunteer and willingly participate in the needs assessment process"--were addressed by much of the data we collected. Our observations and interviews suggest that SRN felt particularly strong about these assumptions. Indeed, the entire process appeared, upon first examination, to conform to them. Yet, our observations and interviews suggest that these assumptions were not always met. The initial step of the staff development process is the decision to engage in the process. Thus, if the assumptions of teacher involvement are met, a school's invitation to SRN to assist the teachers in planning their staff development would be a result of a faculty's decision to plan their own program. This was not always the case.

In both Burr and Collidge Elementary Schools, the needs assessment meetings were requested and planned by the principal. Teachers were not involved in the decision to have the meeting. Many indicated that their attendance was required but they were unaware of the meeting's purpose when they arrived. Although, in both cases, the SRN team attempted to involve the teachers in planning a staff development program, the very presence of the team contradicted at least two assumptions of the SRN process. In Burr

and Collidge, the needs assessment meetings facilitated by SRN teams resulted in no staff development programs. Our observations indicate that the meetings were greeted with hostility by many teachers, with indifference by more, and with enthusiasm or even acceptance by very few. In Collidge, the meeting did not even accomplish its first task, an explication of needs.

By contrast, Douglas Junior High was the school in which we observed the process to work best. It resulted in a program in which many teachers found value. In this case, the initial request for an SRN Facilitation Team came from a committee of teachers. This committee had been at work for some time developing an in-service program for the school's faculty. Their request to SRN for assistance was one step in their work. Most of the other teachers on the faculty appeared to be aware that the SRN Facilitation Team's presence was at the request of the committee. Thus, at Douglas, teachers were involved in the planning and their presence was voluntary.

It would appear that these two assumptions have validity. The most impressive program we observed grew out of a situation in which the assumptions were adhered to. Where we saw them violated, little staff development resulted. Unfortunately, in many cases they were violated, not by SRN teams but by the way in which local administrators chose to involve the teams. It is clear that the first step in developing a staff development program, i.e., deciding to engage in the development, would best involve teachers who perceive themselves as voluntarily engaging in the process. In this case, SRN's assumption, though not always met, appeared to have validity for staff development.

The Role of the Facilitation Team

In the case of two other assumptions, though they seem to have been

scrupulously met by the SRN Teams, their validity is questionable. The eleventh and twelfth assumptions--"The facilitator's function is to assist the group in defining its own needs" and "The facilitator should not be concerned with the content of the meeting"--were translated by most of the facilitation teams into a careful avoidance of assuming the role of consultant. That is, the facilitators felt enjoined by the training they received against giving advice or providing information which they might perceive as beneficial to the faculty group with which they were working. Their initial training, conducted before the beginning of school in September, emphasized this characteristic of their role. After they began work in the Fall, facilitators reported being uncomfortable with this limitation. They felt the need to suggest steps to be taken following the first needs assessment meeting, steps necessary to planning and implementing a staff development program. Yet, in November, during another training session, the same assumptions were again strongly expressed by the trainer employed by SRN. The message the facilitators heard was, "Help the teachers do what they want to do. Don't push them in ways they don't choose to go on their own." These assumptions effectively put all responsibility for follow-up of the needs assessment meeting on the shoulders of the teachers. SRN clearly anticipated that the teachers would request further SRN help in planning their staff development. They waited for the requests to be made. The teachers, however, many times unaware of the possibility that they might request further SRN assistance, waited for others--their principal, SRN--to initiate further action. As a result, in many cases, no further action was taken; the results of the needs assessment were abandoned.

This appears to be a case in which the assumptions underlying SRN's process were followed but the results were less than desirable. Clearly

these assumptions, and the training which projects them, must be reexamined with a view to freeing the facilitators to take a more active role in guiding faculty groups in their planning.

Time and the Process

The tenth assumption--"During the facilitation, as needs are identified, they often emerge in layers"--suggests the importance of sufficient time for the needs assessment portion of the process to work. Our observations suggest that this assumption appears to have validity; with most faculties, needs emerged slowly as the teachers worked through their meeting. Our observations also suggest that the time for this process to work proved to be a major difficulty for the Facilitation Teams. Many teachers reported a resentment for having to devote after school time to the needs assessment meeting. This resentment appears to be endemic to the teachers we interviewed, a result of years of what they perceived to be unsatisfactory in-service activities offered at times when they feel least able to benefit from them.

Especially in the cases where the purpose of the needs assessment meeting was initially unclear to the teachers, where the teachers had not been involved in the decision to have the meeting, conducting a process which is assumed to take considerable time at a time when teachers typically resent forfeiting their time crippled the process' potential benefits. It would appear that the conflicts among time needed for the needs assessment meeting, the time at which it was typically held (after school), and the time which teachers say is most appropriate for in-service work must be reconciled if the potential of the process is to be realized.

The Effectiveness of the Facilitation Team

The seventh assumption--"A school's faculty can be involved in a process of staff development planning by the use of a Facilitation Team"--is

the basic operational assumption on which the SRN Facilitation Team Process is founded. Our observations tend to support its validity within the constraints of other forces working on the Process. With only a few exceptions, the Facilitation Teams we observed appeared to function in an efficient and professional manner, scrupulously attending to the directions offered to them by their training. In almost all cases, their work resulted in a list of staff development needs which appeared to represent the faculty group with which the Team was working. Most teachers with whom the Teams worked expressed respect for the Team's ability, especially noting the freedom they felt to express their ideas in the meeting and the obvious respect with which all faculty members were treated by the Team. Further, many teachers expressed appreciation for the opportunity afforded them by the Facilitation Process to interact with their fellow faculty members. Purposeful interaction among colleagues about substantive school issues appears to be a phenomenon which occurs only rarely in their schools but one that is valued by the teachers we interviewed. The Facilitation Team's emphasis on such open and purposeful communication was welcomed by the teachers.

Where the process resulted in a viable staff development program, the Facilitation Team played an obvious part in that success. Where the results were less than desirable, other factors including characteristics of the school and the administration, the nature of the needs expressed by the faculty group, the time at which the activity took place, and the lack of follow-up appeared to be the strong mitigating variables.

Needs that Emerge for Group Meetings

The third assumption--"Teachers are more likely to change if the changes are perceived to meet their felt needs"--and the sixth assumption--"A school-wide faculty group is the appropriate unit with which to work when involving

teachers in needs assessment"--offered an interesting perspective from which to examine our observation and interview data. When contrasting SRN's "Shopping List" approach to staff development with its "Facilitation Team Approach," a difference in the nature of teachers' needs addressed by the two approaches emerged. While the needs addressed by the "Shopping List" tended to be professonal but personally held needs related to individuals and their classrooms, those addressed by the Facilitation Team Process tended to transcend individual classrooms and be more representative of group held needs relating to cross grade and even school-wide issues. Our observations and interviews suggest that teachers consider both of these types of needs important but tend to nominate or focus on the individual type first. This suggests that the "Facilitation Team Process" may not focus on those needs most personally and individually held by teachers, those needs which appear to be the most pressing for them and with which they would like the most immediate help.

Thus, there would seem to be an inconsistency between these two assumptions. The school-wide faculty group may not be the best forum for identifying the most pressing, personally held needs of teachers. Some teachers suggested that they or their colleagues were not willing to express these needs during the group meeting. To meet these individual, classroom or personal level needs, other more individualized approaches would appear to be as appropriate to staff development as they are to classroom instruction. The "Shopping List" is one approach which SRN employs. Others, e.g., clinical supervision, might be identified as well.

When considering school level needs, however, the "Facilitation Team Process" did appear to us to offer success. Teachers expressed to us the need to work with one another, to consider issues broader than their own

individual classrooms, to pursue solutions to school-wide problems that can only be attacked by the faculty working as a group. Though these school-wide needs appear to be second in priority to teachers' individual needs, they are a strong second and many teachers certainly afford them an importance. The "Facilitation Team Process" developed by SRN appears to be an appropriate approach to their solution.

APPENDIX A - Methodology

Methodology

This study was done by a team of researchers from the Department of Education, University of California at Santa Barbara, at the request of the School Resource Network, Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties. This team was composed of two faculty members and three graduate students who were currently on leave from teaching responsibilities in area schools. This composition of team members was intended to offer a balance between research expertise and practical knowledge of teachers and the conditions of their work. Such a balance was considered important in our effort to penetrate the staff development activities which were the targets of our study and to document those activities as the realities of the participant teachers.

The study was contracted in June of 1980 and data collection was completed by May 1981. As noted earlier, the study originally was commissioned to discover those conditions characterizing a new form of staff development sponsored by SRN, that form being a school-based facilitation model. This model was contrasted, along certain dimensions, with a regionally based client selection model which was on-going at the same time as the Facilitation Teams. Our intention was to discover how the Facilitation Team process worked and to better understand how teachers who participated in the approaches viewed its intent, the manner in which it was carried out, and the results of the staff development activity. This information was to be used by SRN in planning future staff development activities.

We began the study by observing as many of the facilitation meetings as possible in the Fall of 1980. Our intent was to document the basic dimensions of the facilitation process, being guided (but not held to) the questions as outlined in Appendix C, Exhibit 1. We attempted to be present

at a sufficient number of settings in order to select from among those schools a smaller number of schools wherein we could examine in more detail the specifics of the Facilitation Team approach.

As we discuss on pages 29-31 of this report, we attended Facilitation meetings at nine schools and eventually chose three for more in-depth study. This decision was made in December of 1980, when we had a sufficient data base for comparison. Our work at these three schools consisted of observations at any staff development activities held, as well as in-depth interviews with as many of the teachers as were willing to participate (50% in one school, 75+% in the other two schools). The principal also was interviewed at each school. (See Appendix C, Exhibit 2 for the questions posed to teachers and principals.) These data comprised the bulk of the material for this report.

The comparative base present in the client selection or "Shopping List" workshops exists on the basis of close comparability of the topics of those workshops to the main issues addressed in the Facilitation Team meetings held at the three schools. We observed two of the "Shopping List" workshops and conducted interviews with seven teachers who attended the one workshop held locally (a modified version of Exhibit 2, Appendix C was used here). Our purpose here was to ascertain the perceived outcomes of the Facilitation Team and the Shopping List process, holding the "topic" of each workshop as constant as possible.

Finally, having identified certain trends from our data (e.g., the use of staff development for group vs. individual ends, the perceived value of staff development as "non-instrumented," etc.) we were interested in ascertaining if those same trends were present in other schools as well. We had an opportunity to gather such data in nine local schools where we had not

observed or conducted interviews. As some of the teachers in those schools undoubtedly had attended "Shopping List" workshops, and since two schools had scheduled Facilitation Team workshops earlier in the year, we decided to broaden our data base on those issues as well. This resulted in Exhibit 3, Appendix C, which was distributed to the teachers in these nine schools. A return rate of about 50% does not permit us to place too much confidence on these data, but they are suggestive and, in conjunction with other data sources, provide confirmation to several relevant trends.

A summary of data sources and data collection techniues is presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2

Data Sites and Data Collection Procedures

Site	Data Collection Procedures			
School	Initial Observation of Facilitation Teams	Observation of Further Staff Development	Interviews With Teachers, and Staff	Questionnaires
A	X			
B (Burr Elem.)	X		X (9)	
C	X			
D (Douglas JHS)	X	X	X (23)	
E	X			
F	X			
G	X			
H (Hamilton Elem.)	X	X	X (9)	
I	X			
J*			X (3)	
K-S				X (99)
	Initial Observation		Interviews with Participants	
Shopping List Workshops				
1	X		X (7)	
2	X			
SRN Organization				
3 Site Staff			X	
4 Planning Sessions, Training Sessions	X		X	

*Interviews from "Pilot Study" included in sample.

Finally, the conditions under which this study was completed bear noting. Not all of the schools we approached were willing to have us attend their facilitation meeting. Additionally, we had selected two other schools for follow-up interviews but the staff of these schools did not, for various reasons, feel comfortable with our presence and thus declined to participate. What's more, in two of the three schools to which we were granted access a small, but significant, minority of the teachers declined to be interviewed.

Such conditions raise some relevant questions about the representativeness of the data in this report. Yet the study was never intended to be generalizable to the population which the sample represents, but instead is designed to examine some of the basic assumptions of staff development models. Thus, we feel it more important to look at these "non-participation" statistics in light of the general ambivalence, on the part of many teachers, to "outsiders" in general and staff development in particular. As noted in the Results section, teachers perception of the value of staff development definitely is colored by the general conditions that exist throughout much of education today. Whatever the obstacles we encountered in the field, we found that our difficulties were more a function of the general suspicion and "burn out" of teachers, and less a reaction to errors on the part of members of the research team. Such probably is indicative of the climate of the times, on the surface not encouraging but yet still with signs of hope in that teachers are looking critically at some of that which is being asked of them.

APPENDIX B - The Shopping Lists

SECONDARY WORKSHOP SHOPPING LIST

The School Resource Network has a strong conviction that teachers not only want but must have input in selecting and developing their own staff development programs. This shopping list design provides for a matching of potential workshop participants with specific topics. Workshops will be offered for topics receiving at least 20 requests. Each workshop will be planned for a two-hour block of time.

Credit is available through either California Lutheran College or University of California at Santa Barbara at a cost of $15.00 per *semester unit* in addition to the workshop fee. (Attendance at 7 workshops earns one *semester unit*.)

The fee for attending the workshops is $2.00 per session for pre-registrants and $3.00 for those who do not pre-register. Registration materials will be sent after the Shopping Lists are processed and workshops are scheduled.

Timeline:

September 8 - September 26, 1980

Potential participants complete workshop shopping list form

September 26 - November 3, 1980

SRN processes returned shopping lists and determines topics and dates based on input

November 7, 1980

Participants receive workshop announcement

November 24 - April 30, 1981

Workshops

SCHOOL RESOURCE NETWORK

Steve Kingsford, Director

Ricki Mikkelsen, Coordinator

Ventura County Superintendent of Schools Office
535 East Main Street, Ventura, CA 93009
(805) 654-2164

Santa Barbara County Superintendent of Schools Office
4400 Cathedral Oaks Road (P. O. Box 6307)
Santa Barbara, CA 93111
(805) 964-4711, Ext. 206

SCHOOL RESOURCE NETWORK

SECONDARY WORKSHOP SHOPPING LIST

Name _____

School _____ District _____

School Address _____ City _____ Zip_____

School Phone _____ Grade Level _____ Home Phone ( )_____

TOPICS – CHECK APPROPRIATE BOXES (Please, no more than 10!)

General Interest Topics

1. ☐ Alternative Careers for Educators
2. ☐ Assertive Discipline
3. ☐ Classroom Management—How to Teach Effeciently in An Overcrowded Classroom
4. ☐ Communication Skills
5. ☐ Conducting An Effective Conference—Improving the Parent/Teacher/Counselor Relationship
6. ☐ Coordinating the Roles of the Counselor and the Teacher—How to Work Together More Effectively
7. ☐ Dealing with Anger in the Classroom
8. ☐ Discipline—An Overview of 5 Approaches that Work in Secondary Education
9. ☐ Effective Lesson Design
10. ☐ Meeting the Individual Needs of Students—Techniques to Use with Students at Various Levels (including working with large groups, small groups, and individuals)
11. ☐ Motivating the Unmotivated
12. ☐ Organizational Schemes for Fund Raising Projects
13. ☐ Participatory Management
14. ☐ Proficiency Standards—How to Effectively Handle the Students and Their Parents (Conferencing, etc.)
15. ☐ Reinforcing Student Learning
16. ☐ Sex Education
17. ☐ School Law—Student Rights
18. ☐ School Law—Teacher Rights
19. ☐ Substance Abuse
20. ☐ Teacher Stress/Burn Out
21. ☐ Teaching Students to be Independent Learners
22. ☐ Teaching to Left and Right Hemispheres
23. ☐ Time Management—Methods to Cut Down Time Spent on Correcting Papers, Record Keeping, etc.
24. ☐ Utilizing Student Aides—Techniques to Effectively Use Student Aides
25. ☐ What to Do with the Non-English Speaking or Limited English Speaking Student When There is No Program
26. ☐ Energy and the Environment

I Art

27. ☐ New Ideas for Student Projects in Art
28. ☐ New Materials and Trends in Art

29. ☐ Using Centers in Art
30. ☐ Techniques for Diagnosing and Prescribing for Students in Art
31. ☐ Career Education Activities in Art

II Business Education

32. ☐ New Ideas for Student Projects in Business Education
33. ☐ New Materials and Trends in Business Education
34. ☐ Using Centers in Business Education
35. ☐ Techniques for Diagnosing and Prescribing for Students in Business

III English

36. ☐ Directed Reading—Lesson Procedure Including New Ideas to Build Skills in Vocabulary, Word Analysis and Comprehension New Techniques to Develop Writing Skills in:
    - ☐ Paragraphs
    - ☐ Themes
    - ☐ Research Papers
    - ☐ Book Reports
    - ☐ Working Toward Quality Not Quantity
37. ☐ Assessing Writing Using Rubrics
38. ☐ New Ideas for Student Projects in English
39. ☐ New Materials and Trends in English
40. ☐ Using Centers in English
41. ☐ Techniques for Diagnosing and Prescribing for Students in English
42. ☐ Career Education Activities in English

IV Foreign Language

43. ☐ Lasanov Method
44. ☐ New Ideas for Student Projects in Foreign Language
45. ☐ New Materials and Trends in Foreign Language
46. ☐ Using Centers in Foreign Language
47. ☐ Techniques for Diagnosing and Prescribing for Students in Foreign Language
48. ☐ Career Education Activities in Foreign Language

V Homemaking

49. ☐ How to Do More with Less Dollars
50. ☐ New Ideas for Student Projects in Homemaking
51. ☐ New Materials and Trends in Homemaking
52. ☐ Using Centers in Homemaking
53. ☐ Techniques for Diagnosing and Prescribing for Students in Homemaking
54. ☐ Career Education Activities in Homemaking

VI Industrial Arts

55. ☐ How to Do More with Less Dollars
56. ☐ New Ideas for Student Projects in Industrial Arts
57. ☐ New Materials and Trends in Industrial Arts
58. ☐ Using Centers in Industrial Arts

59. ☐ Techniques for Diagnosing and Prescribing for Students in Industrial Arts
60. ☐ Career Education Activities in Industrial Arts

VII Mathematics

61. ☐ Using Games to Reinforce Basic Skills
62. ☐ New Ideas for Student Projects in Mathematics
63. ☐ New Materials and Trends in Mathematics
64. ☐ Using Centers in Homemaking
65. ☐ Techniques for Diagnosing and Prescribing for Students in Mathematics
66. ☐ Career Education Activities in Mathematics

VIII Music

67. ☐ New Ideas for Student Projects in Music
68. ☐ New Materials and Trends in Music
69. ☐ Using Centers in Music
70. ☐ Techniques for Diagnosing and Prescribing for Students in Music
71. ☐ Career Education Activities in Music

IX Physical Education

72. ☐ New Ideas for Student Projects in Physical Education
73. ☐ New Materials and Trends in Physical Education
74. ☐ Using Centers in Physical Education
75. ☐ Techniques for Diagnosing and Prescribing for Students in Physical Education
76. ☐ Career Education Activities in Physical Education

X Science

77. ☐ "Hands-On" Labs
78. ☐ Science Fair Participation
79. ☐ New Ideas for Student Projects in Science
80. ☐ New Materials and Trends in Science
81. ☐ Using Centers in Science
82. ☐ Techniques for Diagnosing and Prescribing for Students in Science
83. ☐ Career Education Activities in Science

XI Speech, Drama and Debate

84. ☐ New Ideas for Student Projects in Speech, Drama and Debate
85. ☐ New Materials and Trends in Speech, Drama and Debate
86. ☐ Using Centers in Speech, Drama and Debate
87. ☐ Techniques for Diagnosing and Prescribing for Students in Speech, Drama and Debate
88. ☐ Career Education Activities in Speech, Drama and Debate

XII Vocational Education

89. ☐ New Ideas for Student Projects in Vocational Education
90. ☐ New Materials and Trends in Vocational Education
91. ☐ Using Centers in Vocational Education
92. ☐ Techniques for Diagnosing and Prescribing for Students in Vocational Education

ELEMENTARY WORKSHOP SHOPPING LIST

The School Resource Network has a strong conviction that teachers not only want but must have input in selecting and developing their own staff development programs. This shopping list design provides for a matching of potential workshop participants with specific topics. Workshops will be offered for topics receiving at least 20 requests. Each workshop will be planned for a two-hour block of time.

Credit is available through either California Lutheran College or University of Southern California at Santa Barbara at a cost of $15.00 per *semester unit* in addition to the workshop fee. (Attendance at 7 workshops earns one *semester* unit.)

The fee for attending the workshops is $2.00 per session for pre-registrants and $3.00 for those who do not pre-register. Registration materials will be sent after the Shopping Lists are processed and workshops are scheduled.

Timeline:

September 8 - September 26, 1980

Potential participants complete workshop shopping list form

September 26 - November 3, 1980

SRN processes returned shopping lists and determines topics and dates based on input

November 7, 1980

Participants receive workshop announcement

November 24 - April 30, 1981

Workshops

SCHOOL RESOURCE NETWORK

Steve Kingsford, Director

Ricki Mikkelsen, Coordinator

Ventura County Superintendent of Schools Office
535 East Main Street, Ventura, CA 93009
(805) 654-2184

Santa Barbara County Superintendent of Schools Office
4400 Cathedral Oaks Road (P. O. Box 6307)
Santa Barbara, CA 93111
(805) 964-4711, Ext. 206

SCHOOL RESOURCE NETWORK

ELEMENTARY WORKSHOP SHOPPING LIST

Name _____

School _____ District _____

School Address _____ School City _____

School Phone _____ Grade Level _____ *Home Phone* _____

☐ lower elementary ☐ upper elementary

TOPICS - CHECK APPROPRIATE BOXES:

Art

1. ☐ Art With Found Objects
2. ☐ Art Projects
3. ☐ Art Appreciation
4. ☐ Drawing
5. ☐ Holiday Art
6. ☐ _____

Billingual Education

7. ☐ Bilingual Teaching Techniques
8. ☐ Bilingual Teaching for a Monolingual Teacher
9. ☐ Materials and Resources for LES/NES Students
10. ☐ Making ILP (Individual Learning Plans) Work
11. ☐ What to Do With LES/NES Students When There is No Program Available
12. ☐ _____

Discipline/Classroom Management

13. ☐ Assertive Discipline
14. ☐ Discipline/Classroom Management Techniques That Work
15. ☐ Dealing with Anger in the Classroom
16. ☐ "Fred Jones" Techniques
17. ☐ _____

Health Education and Safety

18. ☐ Nutrition Education
19. ☐ Safety Education
20. ☐ Sex Education
21. ☐ _____

Mathematics

22. ☐ Addition and Subtraction - Concrete to Abstract
23. ☐ Mathematics Their Way (K-2)
24. ☐ Multiplication - Concrete to Abstract
25. ☐ Division - Concrete to Abstract
26. ☐ Problem-Solving
27. ☐ Mental Math
28. ☐ Unifix Cubes

29. ☐ Place Value
30. ☐ Card and Dice Games to Reinforce Skills
31. ☐ Teaching Time and Money
32. ☐ Metrics
33. ☐ Fractions - Concrete to Abstract
34. ☐ Using Calculators in the Upper Grades
35. ☐ Chisenbop
36. ☐ _____

60

Music

37. ☐ Folk Dancing
38. ☐ Square Dancing
39. ☐ Teaching Music Without a Specialist
40. ☐ Music Appreciation
41. ☐ _____

Physical Education

42. ☐ Parachute Activities
43. ☐ Skill Building - Ball Games
44. ☐ Buzz Glass - Movement Education
45. ☐ "Zazzercise"
46. ☐ _____

Reading/Language

47. ☐ Directed Reading - Lesson Procedure
48. ☐ Vocabulary Development
49. ☐ Word Analysis Skills
50. ☐ Comprehension - Details and Information and Sequence
51. ☐ Comprehension - Cause & Effect and Prediction
52. ☐ Comprehension - Inference and Main Idea
53. ☐ Speaking Skills
54. ☐ Teaching and Assessing Written Language
55. ☐ Readers Theatre
56. ☐ Slingerland Multisensory Approach
57. ☐ Spelling Techniques
58. ☐ Poetry
59. ☐ _____

School Climate

60. ☐ Teacher Morale/Stress/Burn Out
61. ☐ Communication Skills
62. ☐ Parent/Community and Media Support - "A How to Workshop"
63. ☐ How to Positively Influence Education
64. ☐ School Law - Teacher Rights
65. ☐ School Law - Student Rights
66. ☐ _____

Science

67. ☐ Environmental Education
68. ☐ Science-Activities Experiments and Projects
69. ☐ _____

Social Studies/Sciences

70. ☐ Projects for Students
71. ☐ Developing Study and Research Skills
72. ☐ Units of Study
73. ☐ "Outreach" - Bringing the Museum into Your Classroom
74. ☐ Developing Research Skills
75. ☐ _____

Special Education

76. ☐ Understanding PL 94-142 (Mainstreaming)
77. ☐ The I.E.P. Process: Identification through Review
78. ☐ _____

Teaching Strategies

79. ☐ Working with Paraprofessionals
80. ☐ Establishing a Tutorial Program - Cross Volunteers
81. ☐ Effective Lesson Design
82. ☐ Motivation
83. ☐ Reinforcement
84. ☐ Teaching for Transfer
85. ☐ Turning Waiting Time into Learning Time—Sponge Activities
86. ☐ Diagnosis and Prescription
87. ☐ Teaching to Independence
88. ☐ Levels of Questioning
89. ☐ Teaching to the Left and Right Hemispheres
90. ☐ Academic Learning Time - Assessing Time on Task in Your Classroom
91. ☐ Using Centers
92. ☐ Teaching for Creativity
93. ☐ _____

Other

94. ☐ Grantsmanship - How to Write a Proposal
95. ☐ Grants - What Funding Sources are Available
96. ☐ Materials Development - Making Learning Materials for the Classroom
97. ☐ Multicultural Education Activities
98. ☐ Career Education Activities
99. ☐ Alternative Careers for Educators
100. ☐ How to Conduct Inservice Training - A Workshop for Presenters
101. ☐ Learning Centers
102. ☐ Rainy Day Activities
103. ☐ Bulletin Boards
104. ☐ _____

Please return this shopping list to your school's SRN liaison on or before September 24.

APPENDIX C - Data Collection Instruments

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED

STRUCTURE

1. Who initiates the "call" to SRN? What is the ostensible reason for this request?

2. In the session itself, how are the "needs" generated? Which people generate them, and what seems to be the reasons for them being so generated?

3. To what extent is there conflict or disagreement about the value of the needs generated? Over what kind of issues is there disagreement? What is the status of those individuals who disagree?

4. What (if any) institutional history is reflected in debate about these issues?

5. What "needs" are suggested by individuals that later are abandoned or receive low priority? Why?

6. What needs seem to receive the most attention? What are the characteristics to these needs?

7. How is the session concluded? What plans are there for future action? Who is to take responsibility for what?

8. How extensively are SRN services "pushed?" With what results?

PROCESS

9. How are team members legitimated (or not) to staff members? Who performs this role? Is it accepted?

10. What is the overall competence level of the team? What evidence is indicative of this level of competence?

11. Are there any indications of conflict or resistance between the team and the school staff? What are these? How resolved?

12. How does the team handle "minority" issues? Are they resolved, ignored, or buried? With what consequence?

13. What is the role of the team in facilitating steps beyond the present meeting?

I. We appreciate your taking this time. The information we seek covers three main topics. Our first topic is your general assessment of staff development--what it is, its uses, its value for you. Now we realize that "staff development" is a term with many meanings:

1. Could you tell me what you think of when you think of "staff development?" (Probe: What does it include, when is it done, what are its consequences? That is if it does these things, its SD.)

2. Still talking about staff development in general,

   a. Could you provide me with <u>examples</u> of when staff development has been good or useful for you?

   b. What things made these experiences good or useful?

3. Now let's look at the other side of the coin:

   a. Could you provide me with examples of when staff development has <u>not</u> been good or useful for you?

   b. What things made these experiences turn out not to be good or useful?

4. Now, to follow-up on that. If possible, translate those specific experiences into general patterns. Are there any general conditions under which you participate in staff development that:

   a. Make it successful for you.

   b. Serve as obstacles to its success for you.

5. Why is/is not staff development working successfully for you <u>now</u>?

II. This is great, I have a feel now for how you define staff development and what you think is useful and not useful. The next few questions focus specifically on the SRN approach to staff development.

6. Do you remember the facilitation team that visited your school in the Fall to help the school make decisions about staff development?

   a. Describe briefly what happened at that meeting. (Probe - how did it begin, how did in continue, what resulted?)

   b. Can you remember who made the decision about the SRN facilitation team being used?

   c. Why do you think this facilitation team approach was used here?

7. How would you assess the basic strengths and weaknesses of this strategy as it was used in your school? (Probe: How much people knew about it beforehand, extent of follow-up, relation between individual and school needs, worksnop serving instrumental vs. socio-emotional needs, etc.)

8. To what extent is the school any different now than it was before that process took place? (Probe: In what specific areas and for what reasons?)

9. If you were to make proposals to change how the SRN facilitation process operated, what would you propose?

III. OK, that's really great! I have just a few more questions to finish up. You know, we've found that people have a lot of staff development needs, some of which you may have discussed in the facilitation team meeting, others of which you may not have.

10. As a teacher, what are your most pressing current needs?

    a. Can you say a bit more about this?

    b. OK, great. Let me ask the question again and ask you what are your most pressing current needs that could be met through some staff development?

11. Why do you think these needs have not yet been met?

12. What would be the most optimal staff development activity you could envision to satisfy these needs?

13. What would be necessary for that to happen?

(Exhibit 3 - Questionnaire distributed to a sample of teachers in the two Counties)

Your Position (circle one)

Teacher Administrator Staff

Instructions: Please circle the number which best expressed your reaction to each of the following items:

1. When I think of good "staff development," I think of things I can use immediately in my classroom.

   Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

2. When I think of good "staff development," I think of promoting better communication/morale in our school.

   Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

3. The staff development/inservice activities I have been involved in over the past year have been beneficial to me.

   Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

4. My most pressing professonal needs are NOT being met by staff development.

   Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

5. Please reflect on successful staff development/inservice activities you have experiences. List below the characteristics they had in common.

6. Please list your most pressing professional needs below.

Need	Rank Order	Met by S.D.
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Please rank order these with 1 = most pressing.

Please put a check in the appropriate column next to any needs you feel could be met by staff development/inservice.

If during the school year a facilitation team from the School Research Network (SRN) came to your school to help the faculty define their needs, please answer the following questions based upon the context of that meeting and any activities it generated. If your school was not involved in such a process, place a large X at the end of this sentence and go on to the next page.

7. My assessments of the strengths and weaknesss of the SRN facilitation activity are:

   a. It was useful in assessing school-wide staff development needs.

      Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

   b. It was NOT useful in assessing my own professional needs.

      Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

   c. It was useful in planning activities based on these needs.

      Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

   d. It was useful in providing an opportunity for the staff to communicate.

      Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

   e. It was not needed at our school at this time.

      Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

8. This facilitation activity results in:
   (check as many as applicable)

   ____ a. improved communication among the staff.
   ____ b. improved morale among the staff.
   ____ c. specific workshop(s) aimed at identified needs.
   ____ d. other (describe)_____.
   ____ e. no significant changes at my school.

9a. The activities that resulted from the facilitation workshop DID NOT satisfactorily meet staff needs.

      Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

9b. _____ no activities resulted.

10a. As a result of the visit of the facilitation team and/or any activities that resulted, the ways I work as a teacher have changed.

      Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

10b. Please comment on your answer to 10a.

If during the school year you filled out a "menu" provided by the School Resource Network (SRN) on possible inservice workshops, please answer the following questions. If you did not fill out such a menu, please place an X at the end of this sentence and go on to the next page.

12. Selecting from the menu allowed me to specify my most pressing professional needs.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

13. The results of the menu process were:
(check as many as applicable)

____ a. I chose a workshop from the menu and subsequently attended a workshop on that topic.
____ b. I attended a workshop but it was not on a topic I originally chose from the menu.
____ c. I chose a workshop from the menu but a workshop was not held on that topic.

If you checked 13a. or 13b., please answer questions 14, 15, and 16.
If not, skip to the comments section.

14. I attended the following workshop(s):

1._____

2._____

3._____

15. The workshop(s) I attended was NOT significant in meeting my professional needs.

a) Workshop one: Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree
b) Workshop two: Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree
c) Workshop three: Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

16. As a result of the workshop(s) I attended, I find that the ways I work as a teacher have been changed.

a) Workshop one: Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree
b) Workshop two: Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree
c) Workshop three: Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

17. Please comment on your answer to 16.

Any general comments or suggestions:

APPENDIX D - Summary of Questionnaire Data

Questionnaire Item	Number Responding	Mean	Standard Deviation
1. Staff Dev. = things useful in classroom*	98	4.22	1.15
2. Staff Dev. = better communication in school	99	3.91	1.09
3. Staff Dev. has been beneficial	97	2.99	1.17
4. Professional needs are NOT being met by S.D.	95	3.38	1.35
5. Characteristics of successful S.D.	-	-	-
6. List most pressing professional needs.	-	-	-
7. SRN Facilitation was:			
a. useful for own professional needs	25	3.40	1.38
b. NOT useful for own professional needs	25	4.00	1.12
c. useful for planning activities	25	2.32	1.22
d. useful for staff communication	24	3.88	1.12
e. not needed at our school	25	2.56	1.29
8. SRN Facilitation resulted in:			
a. improved communication	22	2.91	2.00
b. improved morale	11	3.45	1.13
c. specific workshops	2	3.00	0.00
d. other	0	0	0
e. no significant changes	0	0	0
9. Activities that resulted from the Facilitation:			
a. did not satisfactorily meet staff needs	18	3.67	2.14
b. no activities resulted	10	1.00	0.00
10. As result of SRN Facilitation my work has changed	21	1.67	1.02

Summary of Questionnaire Data (continued)

Questionnaire Item	Number Responding	Mean	Standard Deviation
12. Menu contained most pressing processional needs	26	3.92	0.89
13. Results of menu process were:			
a. I chose workshop and attended	24	1.88	0.99
b. attended workshop other than choice	2	2.50	0.71
c. workshop I chose wasn't held	0	0	0
14. Workshops I attended	-	-	-
15. Workshops I attended did NOT meet my professional needs			
a. workshop #1	14	1.64	0.63
b. workshop #2	0	0	0
c. workshop #3	0	0	0
16. As a result of workshop my work has changed			
a. workshop #1	13	4.00	1.00
b. workshop #2	0	0	0
c. workshop #3	0	0	0

REFERENCES

Edelfelt, Roy, "Staff Development: An Overview," Journal of Research and Development in Education, 13(4), 111-121.

McKibben, Michael & Bruce Joyce, "Psychological States and Staff Development," Theory into Practice, 19 (Autumn, 1980), 248-55.

Perry, Roger H. "The Organizational/Environmental Variables in Staff Development," Theory into Practice, 19 (Autumn, 1980), 256-61.

Journal of Education, 162 (Spring, 1981).

Theory into Practice, 19 (Autumn, 1980).

Journal of Research and Development in Education, 13(4), 1980-1.